

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the present application, none of which have been amended.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *McClennon et al.* (US 6,721,355) in view of *Morishita* (US 6,184,744). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Claim 1 (and similarly Claim 11) recites a step of "in response to an amount of data that needed to be sent by said sender, adjusting a supply voltage level by said sensor to said sending driver accordingly."

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner characterizes *McClennon*'s data traffic predictor **120** shown in Figure 3 as the claimed sensor, and asserts that the claimed adjusting step is disclosed by *McClennon* in col. 4, lines 43-65. According to *McClennon*, the communications link is monitored for incoming data traffic, and the periodicity of the incoming traffic is determined (col. 4, lines 47-50). One of the two power modes (*i.e.*, a full on power mode and a quiescent power mode) of a modem is then selected based on the determined periodicity of the incoming data traffic (col. 4, lines 50-52). Since *McClennon*'s teachings are related to incoming data traffic, it is not relevant to the claimed adjusting step that is related to data to be transmitted (*i.e.*, outgoing data).

In the remaining portion of the Examiner's cited passage (*i.e.*, col. 4, lines 53-65), *McClennon* further teaches that the data traffic predictor can be utilized to estimate data traffic over a communications link to permit power management in the modem. The data traffic predictor includes a data traffic monitor for detecting incoming data traffic at the modem as well as the arrival rate of the incoming data. The data traffic predictor also includes a periodicity detector for processing arrival rate as well as periodicity of the incoming data, and a power mode controller for determining one of the two above-mentioned power modes for modem operation

based on the determined periodicity of the incoming data traffic. Thus, *McClennon*'s data traffic predictor is designed to handle incoming data traffic, which is again not relevant to the claimed adjusting step that is related to data to be transmitted (*i.e.*, outgoing data).

Claim 1 also recites a step of "transmitting data from said sender by said sending driver on said transmission line to said receiving driver according to said adjusted supply voltage level."

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed transmitting step is disclosed by *McClennon* in col. 4, lines 8-18. In col. 4, lines 8-18, *McClennon* teaches that a method for power management in a modem attached to a communications link includes monitoring a communications link for incoming data traffic, and if data traffic is detected on the communications link, the periodicity of the incoming data is determined. The power mode of the modem is then determined based on the determined periodicity of the incoming data traffic. Once again, since *McClennon*'s teachings are related to incoming data traffic, it is not relevant to the claimed transmitting step that is related to data to be transmitted.

The Examiner also cites *Morishita* as a reference with col. 1, lines 17-41 for teaching power regulation. Applicants agree with the Examiner that the reduction of power supply voltage allows the power consumption to be reduced in proportion to the square of the voltage reduction ratio, as explained in col. 1, lines 22-24 of *Morishita*. However, *Morishita* still does not teach or suggest the claimed adjusting step being performed "in response to an amount of data that needed to be sent by said sender." Also, the claimed adjusting step involves both increasing and decreasing power supply voltage level, and not just the reduction of power supply voltage, as taught by *Morishita*.

Because the claimed invention recites novel features that are not found in the cited references, whether consider separately or in combination, the § 103 is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 1 and 11 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any addition fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of the present application, please charge it against IBM Deposit Account No. **09-0456**.

Respectfully submitted,



Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS